

**REMARKS**

Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12 and 13 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 4 and 6 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Support for the amendments to claims 4 and 6 can be found, for example, in Fig. 2. In addition, typographical informalities have been corrected in the specification. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

**I. Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner is requested to consider the information submitted with the August 25, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement. The Examiner is requested to return an initialed copy of the PTO-1449, which was included with the August 25 Information Disclosure Statement, with the next Patent Office communication.

**II. All Pending Claims Are Patentable**

Claims 4, 5, 8 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,300,976 to Fukuoka. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest the combinations of features recited in independent claims 4, 8 and 12.

Fukuoka discloses an I/O card 15 that can be coupled to a camera to transmit information from the camera to an external device via communication line 24. See, for example, col. 2, lines 57-62. In the Fig. 2 embodiment, a separate memory card 16 is provided for connection to a different connector of the camera, and Fukuoka discloses that information can be "transmitted to the memory or I/O card in real time." See col. 8, lines 25-27. Fukuoka thus discloses that the information is either stored in memory 16 or transmitted to an external destination. Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest that the information that is transmitted also is backed up in a memory. In the Fig. 8 embodiment, Fukuoka discloses that the memory function performed by separate memory card 16 can be included in the I/O card 15. See, for example, col. 12, lines 17-30. However, even in this

embodiment, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest that the information to be transmitted is backed-up in the I/O card.

With respect to independent claim 4, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest a wireless communication unit that is a stand-alone unit and that performs wireless communication. As noted above, I/O card 15 of Fukuoka transmits information through communication line 24, not wirelessly. To perform wireless communication, the communication line 24 must be connected to "either a cellular or wireless phone." See col. 3, lines 33-39. In addition, and as described above, Fukuoka et al. does not disclose or suggest the claim 4 "control portion" that transmits information through a wireless communication portion to an external destination and generates a backup of the information to the recording portion. Fukuoka discloses storing or transmitting in the alternative and does not disclose generating a backup of information that is to be wirelessly transmitted. Furthermore, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest the claim 4 mode input portion for enabling a user to set either "a communication and backup mode" or "a recording mode" as recited in claim 4. The portions of Fukuoka referenced in the Office Action merely disclose that information can be transmitted or recorded, but these portions of Fukuoka do not disclose or suggest the two separate modes of claim 4. Accordingly, independent claim 4 and its dependent claim 5 are not anticipated by Fukuoka.

With respect to independent claim 8, as noted above, the I/O card 15 of Fukuoka does not perform wireless communication. In addition, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest the claim 8 control portion that performs the functions of "acquiring information to be recorded from said main device while imitating a recording operation" and "transmitting said acquired information through said wireless communication portion." Fukuoka does not imitate a recording operation while transmitting acquired information. As discussed above, Fukuoka either actually performs a recording operation or it transmits information. In addition, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest a control portion that "selects said information with

predetermined attribute information and transmits said selected information through said wireless communication portion" as recited in claim 8. In rejecting this feature of claim 8, the Office Action refers to col. 5, lines 29-34 and col. 6, lines 18-54 of Fukuoka. However, these portions of Fukuoka do not disclose or suggest transmitting information based upon attribute information associated with that information. At col. 6, lines 60-64, Fukuoka describes an attribute memory 41; however, the attribute memory merely stores data about the card 15, not attribute information about the image and/or audio information that is to be transmitted and that is used for selecting the information to be transmitted. Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable over Fukuoka.

Regarding independent claim 12, as described above, the I/O card 15 of Fukuoka does not perform wireless communication. In addition, and as discussed above with respect to independent claim 8, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest a control portion that performs the functions of "acquiring information to be recorded from said main device while imitating a recording operation" and "transmitting said acquired information through said wireless communication portion" as also recited in independent claim 12. Furthermore, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest a wireless communication unit that is divided into a connection unit including the interface portion and a body unit including the wireless communication portion as recited in claim 12. In rejecting claim 12, the Office Action asserts that the card connector of the I/O card corresponds to the connection unit and that the I/O card itself corresponds to the body unit. However, by the Office Action's own interpretation, the card connector (the alleged connection unit) is part of the I/O card (the alleged body unit). Thus, Fukuoka does not disclose a wireless communication unit that is divided into separate body and connection units as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 is not anticipated by Fukuoka.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 5, 8 and 12 is requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fukuoka in view of U.S. 2002/0109859 to Tipirneni. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Like independent claim 4, independent claim 6 recites that the wireless communication unit is a stand-alone unit. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 4, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest a wireless communication unit that is a stand-alone unit. The I/O card 15 of Fukuoka transmits information through communication line 24, not wirelessly. In addition, and as discussed above with respect to independent claim 4, Fukuoka does not disclose or suggest the claim 6 control portion that transmits information to an external destination and generates a backup of the information in the recording portion. Tipirneni does not provide any of these deficiencies in Fukuoka. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over the combination of Fukuoka and Tipirneni for at least these reasons.

In addition, Tipirneni does not suggest modifying the Fukuoka system so as to automatically delete backup information from the recording portion after transmission of the information by the wireless communication portion is normally terminated.

Paragraph [0032] of Tipirneni, referenced in the Office Action, indicates that information that has been successfully transmitted from uploader system 50 to host server 110 can be automatically erased after some predetermined time period. However, the information transmitted between uploader system 50 and host server 110 is not wirelessly transmitted. Rather, the uploader system 50 is linked to host server 110 by a modem and telephone line. See, for example, paragraph [0030], lines 1-8 of Tipirneni. Thus, and contrary to what is asserted in the Office Action, Tipirneni does not disclose automatic deletion after successful wireless communication. Thus, independent claim 6 is patentable over the combination of Fukuoka and Tipirneni for this additional reason.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Independent claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fukuoka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,004 to Komori. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 6, the I/O card 15 of Fukuoka does not perform wireless communication, and the Fukuoka system does not perform the functions of "acquiring information to be recorded from said main device while imitating a recording operation" and "transmitting said acquired information through said wireless communication portion" as also recited in independent claim 10. Komori does not overcome these deficiencies in Fukuoka. Thus, independent claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Fukuoka and Komori for at least these reasons.

In addition, and contrary to what is asserted in the Office Action, Komori does not suggest modifying the Fukuoka system such that the "control portion prohibits power supply from said main device to said wireless communication unit from being stopped by imitating the recording operation done on said main device through said interface, while performing wireless communication with said wireless communication portion." In Komori, programs are written from device 30 into flash ROM area 141. See col. 4, lines 10-29 of Komori. Thus, Komori does not even relate to a system in which a wireless communication unit wirelessly transmits information from a main device to an external destination by imitating a recording operation of the information from the main device so that the main device is prohibited from stopping the supply of power to the wireless communication unit. The microcomputer 11 of Komori (which includes the flash ROM area 141) controls the procedure and does not receive power from the device 30 that supplies the information. Thus, the combination of Fukuoka and Komori does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in independent claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fukuoka in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,306 to Watanabe et al. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

Fukuoka in view of U.S. 2003/0063196 to Palatov et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Neither Watanabe et al. nor Palatov et al. overcomes the deficiencies in Fukuoka discussed above with respect to independent claims 8 and 12 from which these claims respectively depend. Thus, claims 9 and 13 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 8 and 12, respectively. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: January 4, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--